DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 359 UD 021 321

AUTHOR	Figueroa, Richard A.; Gallegos, Elmer A.
TITLE	Ethnic Differences in School Behavior. Bilingual Education Paper Series, Vol. 3, No. 7.
INSTITUTION	California State Univ., Los Angeles. National Dissemination and Assessment Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 80
NOTE	32p.; Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Patterns; *Behavior Rating Scales; *Cultural Differences; *Differences; Elementary Education; *Hispanic Americans; Latin Americans; Mexican Americans; Spanish Americans; *Student Behavior; Whites
IDENTIFIERS	California; Castaneda (Alfredo); Ramirez (Manuel)

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of the Ramirez and Castaneda rating scale used to distinguish ethnic behaviors in schools and to generate a more comprehensive scale for identifying those behaviors. Two hundred and sixty two elementary school children and 39 teachers from Spanish bilingual and English as a Second Language classes in California participated in the study. A 108 item rating scale was developed by generating behavioral descriptions of social and affective characteristics of Hispanic children and by including items from the Ramirez and Castaneda scale. Each teacher completed eight ratings, four on Hispanic children and four on Anglo children. For the analysis of results, the Hispanic children were divided into three groups: Mexican-Americans, Latin-Americans, and United States born Spanish-surnamed. Results of a one-way analysis of variance indicated that 26 behavioral items and one Ramirez and Castaneda item differentiated among the four ethnic group means. Multivariate analysis showed that the Ramirez and Castaneda items failed to differentiate among the three Hispanic group means. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199359

Bilingual Education
PAPER SERIES

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CHARLES F. LEYBA
NATIONAL DISSEMINATION AND ASSESSMENT CENTER
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

National Dissemination
and Assessment Center
California State University, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA. 90032

UD021321

ISSN 0161-3707

Vol. 3 No. 7
February 1980

ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN SCHOOL BEHAVIOR

Richard A. Figueroa
University of California,
Davis

Elmer A. Gallegos
San Francisco Unified
School District

The subject of this publication was supported in whole or in part by the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education; no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

This publication was printed with funds provided by the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by Public Law 93.380.

ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN SCHOOL BEHAVIOR*

Richard A. Figueroa
Elmer A. Gallegos

Information from Hispanic parents, students, and teachers concerning the behavioral differences between Anglo and Hispanic children was used to generate a behavioral rating scale. Two hundred and sixty-two children from four ethnic groups (Latino, Mexican, United States born Spanish surnamed, and Anglo) were rated by 39 Spanish bilingual teachers using this rating scale. Though substantial differences among the ethnic groups' behavioral ratings were noted, socio-economic variables may have been more pervasive than ethnicity in accounting for most of the negative perceptions about Mexican children. This is a critical finding since bilingual programs often assume that language and cultural variables are primary in matching student traits with educational treatments. Data on Ramírez and Castañeda's (1974) rating scales of field dependent and field independent behaviors indicate that such measures may not adequately distinguish between these two types of behavior.

Racial-ethnic differences in patterns of mental abilities have received substantial attention and empirical verification in the last decade. The most impressive and influential of these

---

*The research for this paper was supported by *The Project to Advance Cultural Opportunities* (PACO), ESEA Title VII Project Number 140386, and by a faculty grant from the University of California, Davis.

The authors are grateful for the assistance of the Program Development Team: Ted Briones, Ruth Martinez, Flora Ruegg, Frank Manriquez, Nora Luke, Joey Lavat, and Delfina Sabogal-Tori.

investigations is Lesser *et al.* (1964) study and its replication by Stodolsky and Lesser (1967). Both dramatically document differences in verbal, reasoning, number, and spatial abilities among Chinese, Jewish, Black, and Puerto Rican children. The consistency of each pattern of abilities for each ethnic group was highlighted insofar as each pattern retained essentially the same configuration in low and middle SES groups within each ethnic population. Studies by Leifer (1972) and Backman (1972) generally support Lesser *et al.* (1965) findings relative to Jewish children's verbal precocity and Oriental children's aptitude in computational abilities.

Studies by Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) and Castañeda *et al.* (1975) report that Mexican-American children from homes where traditional Mexican values are emphasized in child-rearing score significantly lower than Anglo children on measures of field dependence. This is a particularly important finding for researchers involved in the study of ethnic differences since Witkin *et al.* (1962) have accumulated a substantial amount of evidence over the last three decades concerning the perceptual, personality, and cognitive dimensions tapped by measures of field dependence.

These results could be brought to bear on the question of ethnic differences. Ramírez and Castañeda (1974), in fact, draw heavily on certain aspects of field dependence research and in extrapolating social policy from it. They outline extensive pedagogical and curricular treatments geared to Mexican-American children's field-dependent styles and to Anglo children's field independent styles. In effect, they basically propose a variant of the trait-treatment-interaction model for educational intervention

advocated by Cronbach and Snow (1969) and Berliner and Cahen (1973). However, the emphasis of their text is not exclusively in the direction of delineating educational policy based on interaction outcomes. Rather, they propose a "bicognitive" model of education wherein field-dependent and field-independent cognitive styles are taught across ethnic groups. Their text does not address the feasibility of such an undertaking, particularly if the field-dependence traits are more developmental than environmental.

Though Ramírez and Castañeda's (1974) text essentially relies on one empirical investigation (Ramírez and Price-Williams, 1974) that awaits extensive replication, the enterprise is at a minimum a unique contribution to heuristics signaling a clear improvement over the usual post-hoc rationale about "cultural differences" used to explain the educational under-attainment of Mexican-American children. What emerges is a theoretically-based perspective on the possible causes of the Chicano child's educational under-achievement and an empirical approach to a strategy for educational intervention. One aspect of their work deals with the assessment and differentiation of field-dependent and field-independent child behaviors, teaching styles, and curricular programs. Rating scales that use a Likert format are presented for this purpose. Of particular interest to the present study are the rating scales that can be used by teachers for distinguishing field-dependent (Mexican-American) and field-independent (Anglo) child behaviors. No empirical evidence for their validity is given by Ramírez and Castañeda (1974), although the scales are presented for the purpose of assessment and educational intervention.

This study investigates not only these scales' effectiveness but also the possibility of generating a more comprehensive rating scale for identifying "ethnic behaviors."

Parents and students from Mexican and Latino backgrounds were interviewed about the unique behavioral characteristics of children from their ethnic group as contrasted with children from an Anglo cultural heritage. Teachers in elementary, bilingual education, and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) classes were also asked to differentiate between children from Spanish-speaking backgrounds and Anglo children on the basis of behavior observed in class. A large pool of behavioral items was generated from these interviews. Teachers were then asked to rate two Anglo children and two Hispanic children on each item using a five-point Likert scale. The expectation was that there would be considerable differences among the ethnic groups in the teacher-perceived occurrence or non-occurrence of the behaviors described by the items. Items which Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) designate as being descriptive of field dependent behaviors and more characteristic of Chicano children as well as items that are designated as being more field independent and more characteristic of Anglo children were included in this large pool to see if, as posited by Ramírez and Castañeda (1974), they do empirically differentiate these two "types" of school-observed behaviors.

As noted, "cultural differences" are often used in a post-hoc manner to explain educational and psychometric differences when minority populations score significantly below Anglo populations. Lack of behavioral specificity regarding "cultural differences"

not only diminishes credibility and interest in the possible intervening cultural variables that may be responsible for test differences but it also works to the detriment of minority children when "cultural awareness" and "cultural sensitivity" programs are set up for teachers in order to ameliorate under-achievement. These often produce benignness rather than understanding and may be implicated in the sort of random classroom reinforcement of Chicano children that is insufficient for maximizing effort or improving academic competence (Fernandez *et al.* 1975). To date, aside from the work of Ramírez and Castañeda (1974), the research on the cooperative behaviors and motives of Chicano children (Kagan and Madsen, 1972) stands alone in the sense of providing valid behavioral-cultural traits that have relevance for education.

Bilingual and predominantly Hispanic teachers were used in this study. It was felt that by using teachers who taught in bilingual and ESL classes as raters, there would be a greater likelihood of identifying cultural differences in school behaviors rather than linguistic and socio-economic differences. The combination of ethnic similarity and professional preparation sensitive to cultural pluralism (advocated in bilingual teacher-training programs on a national and state level) on the part of the raters should have been sufficient to guarantee a more reliable and valid set of observational judgments than would normally be the case.

METHOD

Subjects

Two hundred sixty-two elementary school-aged children from a large Northern California school district's Spanish bilingual and ESL classes participated in this study. Table 1 describes their distribution by grade, ethnicity, and sex. Ethnicity is

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY GRADE, ETHNICITY, AND SEX

	Mexican		*Latino*		*USSS*		*Anglo*		
Grade	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
K	4	1	3		2	6	5	7	
1	8	12	6	3	7	6	5	10	
2	5	6	5	7	8	4	7	8	
3	2	4	5	1	7	6	3	6	
4	5	4	6	4	1	5	4	6	
5		4	4	5	4	5	5	5	
6	2	5	5	7	3	3		1	
TOTAL	26	36	34	27	32	35	29	43	262

defined by birthplace. The Mexican children were all born in Mexico, the Latino children in either Central (90 percent) or South America (10 percent), the United States-born Spanish-surnamed, and the Anglo children in the United States. It was not possible to precisely determine the ethnic background of the United States Spanish-surnamed group. However, from the school district's population percentages it is estimated that the majority of the chil-

dren in this group are Mexican-American.

It should be noted that the the unusual diversity of Hispanic children within our sample may *not* be unique to the school district utilized in this study. Census figures (United States Bureau of the Census, 1972) indicate that the Hispanic population in the United States, especially the Southwest, is substantially more diverse than usually described in the research literature.

The subjects were selected by 39 teachers in Spanish bilingual and ESL classes. These teachers comprised over 70 percent of the Spanish bilingual program personnel in the school district. Each teacher was instructed on how to randomly select four Spanish-speaking and four non-Spanish-speaking students in their classes. The ethnic distribution of all children rated and a follow-up check indicated that a random selection of subjects had taken place. Fifty subjects, in fact, were eliminated since their ethnic backgrounds did not coincide with those included in this study.

A measure of socio-economic status was taken. The ratio of people per room in each family, as used by Mercer (1972), was collected for 60 percent of the subjects. This ratio provides an index of family size, housing, and the "degree of crowdedness" imposed by financial conditions. The people per room ratio is 1.18 (N = 44) for the United States Spanish-surnamed group, .98 (N = 42) for the Anglo group, 1.16 (N = 35) for the Latino group, and 1.58 (N = 36) for the Mexican group. There is no statistical difference between the United States Spanish-surnamed, Anglo, and Latino ratios. The Mexican group's, however, is significantly different ($p < .05$) from the other three groups' ratios indicating

a lower economic status. This is a surprising finding since the school district has never described the foreign-born Mexican population as being more-at-risk than the other Hispanic groups. In fact, just in terms of family size, the Mexican child has a substantially different social environment than that of his other Hispanic and Anglo peers. The average number of persons in the family for the Mexican child is 7.32 (N = 50) versus 5.73 (N = 59) for the United States Spanish-surnamed child, 4.42 (N = 64) for the Anglo, and 4.82 (N = 56) for the Latino.

PROCEDURE

Work on this study began one year before the subjects were actually rated by their teachers. A small group of Spanish-bilingual teachers, designated as the Program Development Team (PDT), initially attempted to develop a practical assessment system aimed at identifying the unique, social, and affective characteristics of Mexican-Latino children. It was planned that once these characteristics were identified, teachers could be trained to utilize them in curriculum and instruction. These characteristics would provide ethnic patterns of behaviors that could also be used to sensitize students, teachers, and administrators on the specific meanings of cultural pluralism and ethnic diversity.

The PDT's observations were used to generate 107 behavioral descriptions. Each of these items required a judgment about the relative occurrence or non-occurrence of the behavior along a five-point Likert scale. A group of articulate secondary school students of Mexican-Latino backgrounds were interviewed about the

differences they perceived between Anglo and Hispanic children. Their observations were incorporated into the item pool. A similar procedure was followed with a group of Hispanic parents. Finally, 52 teachers from the Spanish bilingual program were interviewed in small groups. Their comments and observations were included in the items.

There was a high degree of agreement among all the groups interviewed about the distinguishing behavioral characteristics of Hispanic and Anglo children. One hundred and eight items emerged from this entire process. Each item required a rating from 1 (never) to 5 (always) designating the degree of observed occurrence of the described behavior. The final product revealed that the information collected from all the groups went beyond the behaviors of children and included parental behaviors that related to participation in school activities. These were retained in the final version of the rating scale and formed a "parent-behavior" component. Ramírez and Castañeda's (1974) eight items that define student field-dependent (Mexican) behaviors and the eight for field-independent (Anglo) items were also included in the final version of the rating scale. All the items, however, were mixed so that none of the different clusters of items (i.e., child behaviors, parent behaviors, and field-dependence behaviors) remained intact.

Detailed explanations about the purpose of the rating scale and on how to use it were sent to the 39 teachers who participated in the study. These teachers were brought together and directed to complete an entire rating scale in order to insure that the

procedures were clear and in order to clarify any questions about the items and the rating process. They were instructed not to guess but rather to answer the items on the basis of knowledge or observation. Each teacher was asked to complete, over the course of 45 days, seven other rating scales--four on Hispanic children and four on Anglo children.

All the teachers were fluent Spanish speakers and had known the subjects for at least six months. Of the 39 teachers who participated in the study, 26 were Hispanic (66 percent), nine were Anglo (33 percent), three were Chinese (7 percent), and one was Filipino (2 percent).

The completed rating scales on the subjects were grouped according to ethnic group: United States Spanish-surnamed, Anglo, Mexican, and Latino. Grade levels were collapsed in the analysis in order to focus on teacher-perceived, behavioral difference *at the elementary school level*. This would, in effect, suppress chronological age differences in behavior and highlight culturally dominant, cross-age differences. For the field-dependence items, this type of grouping should not affect results. Ethnic differences in field dependence between Anglo and Chicano as well as between Anglo and Mexican children have been documented up to the age of 12 (Canavan, 1969; Holtzman *et al.*, 1975).

Each item was analyzed across the four ethnic group mean ratings given by the teachers using a one-way analysis of variance procedure. Scheffé contrasts among the four group means were done on the items with significant F-ratios.

Though Ramírez and Castañeda's (1974) items were included in this analysis, it was decided that a more powerful statistical

procedure should be applied to their items. Unlike the items developed in this study, they are not "experimental" but are published for use, nationally distributed, and given substantial attention in bilingual education programs (Baca, 1976). More importantly, however, their small number make such an analysis feasible since it meets the restrictions imposed by the substitution of missing data (i.e., the loss of degrees of freedom), a requirement that would be quite impossible to meet if the entire rating scale were so analyzed.

A multivariate analysis of the 16 items was conducted on the ratings given to 50 United States Spanish-surnamed, 50 Anglo, 50 Latino, and 50 Mexican subjects. These subjects were taken from the 262 used in the study. They were selected because the ratings in each of the 16 items were relatively free of missing data. The distribution of the subjects by grade and sex remained proportionally similar to that presented in Table 1. Items that did have missing data had that data substituted by the following procedure:

$$X_i = \bar{X}_i + ZS_i$$

where:

X_i = the value to be substituted

$\bar{X}_i$ = the ethnic group's mean score for that item

Z = a randomly selected Z value from a N (0, 1) distribution

S_i = the ethnic group's standard deviation score for that item

Each substitution subtracts one degree of freedom from the error term in the multivariate analysis. There were 25 substitutions. Three hypotheses were examined in the multivariate procedure: equality of mean vectors between United States Spanish-surnamed and Anglo, Latino and Anglo, and Mexican and Anglo groups.

Spearman-Brown split-half reliability co-efficients were calculated for the samples and items used in both analyses.

RESULTS

From the one-way analysis of variance procedure, eighteen student-behavior items, eight parent behavior items, and one item from Ramírez and Castañeda's (1974) scales significantly differentiated ($p < .05$) among the four ethnic-group means. Table 2 presents each of the significant items, the mean score for each ethnic group on each item, the number of teachers that answered the item (N), and the significant inter-group contrasts. High mean scores signify "more of" the described behavior. The *student items* are grouped according to similarity of topic and placed under four headings: affective, social, verbal, and cognitive.

The more powerful multivariate analysis of the 16 Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) items failed to differentiate between the United States Spanish-surnamed/Anglo, Latino/Anglo, and Mexican/Anglo groups.

The overall Spearman-Brown reliability co-efficient for the sample and the items used in the one-way analysis of variance was

Table 2

Student, Parent, and Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) Items that Differentiate (.05) among the Four Ethnic-Group Means; the (N's) per Item; and the Significant (.05) Scheffé Contrasts

	Group Means and (N's)				
	1 United States Spanish-surnamed	2 Anglo	3 Latino	4 Mexican	Contrasts[a]
			Student Items		
Affective					
1. The student is timid and shy.	2.34 (67)	2.09 (72)	2.31 (61)	2.67 (62)	$\bar{X}_4 - \bar{X}_2$ $\bar{X}_4 - (\bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3)$ $\bar{X}_4 - (\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3)$
2. The student is shy on the playground.	2.1 (67)	1.96 (72)	2.07 (59)	2.45 (60)	$\bar{X}_4 - (\bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3)$
Social					
3. Other children ask the student about school work.	3.01 (67)	2.9 (72)	2.62 (61)	2.6 (60)	$\bar{X}_1 - (\bar{X}_3 + \bar{X}_4)$ $(\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2) - (\bar{X}_3 + \bar{X}_4)$
4. The student helps his/her peers with school work.	3.34 (67)	3.31 (72)	3.13 (61)	2.87 (60)	$(\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2) - \bar{X}_4$ $(\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3) - \bar{X}_4$

Table 2 (continued)

	Group Means and (N's)				
	1 United States Spanish-surnamed	2 Anglo	3 Latino	4 Mexican	Contrasts[a]
5. The student blames others.	2.43 (65)	2.79 (71)	2.85 (61)	2.48 (61)	$(\bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3) - (\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_4)$
6. It is easy to identify the student's best friends.	3.83 (66)	3.82 (72)	3.85 (60)	3.41 (61)	$(\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_3) - \bar{X}_4$ $(\bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3) - \bar{X}_4$ $(\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3) - \bar{X}_4$
7. The student hits others.	2.04 (67)	2.39 (71)	2.43 (60)	1.84 (61)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$ $\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_4$ $(\bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3) - (\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_4)$
8. The student prefers the company of Spanish-speaking children.	3.30 (66)	2.77 (70)	3.58 (60)	3.66 (58)	$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$ $\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_2$ $\bar{X}_4 - \bar{X}_2$
9. The student is well-mannered.	4.17 (65)	4.08 (71)	3.98 (61)	4.4 (62)	$\bar{X}_4 - (\bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3)$
0. The student asks for help from peers.	2.91 (66)	2.64 (70)	2.93 (61)	3.11 (61)	$\bar{X}_4 - \bar{X}_2$

Table 2 (continued)

	Group Means and (N's)				
	1 United States Spanish-surnamed	2 Anglo	3 Latino	4 Mexican	Contrasts[a]
Verbal					
11. The student is verbally assertive.	3.55 (65)	4.0 (66)	3.68 (59)	3.37 (60)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$
12. The student volunteers answers.	3.72 (65)	3.9 (72)	3.65 (60)	3.44 (62)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$
13. The student has difficulty expressing himself/herself.	1.76 (66)	1.39 (71)	2.07 (59)	2.08 (61)	$\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_2$ $\bar{X}_4 - \bar{X}_2$ $(\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_3 + \bar{X}_4) - \bar{X}_2$
Cognitive					
14. The student learns quickly.	3.76 (67)	4.1 (72)	3.98 (61)	3.58 (62)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$ $\bar{X}_2 - (\bar{X}_4 + \bar{X}_1)$
15. The student works at a fast pace.	3.08 (64)	3.49 (67)	3.03 (60)	2.93 (59)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$
16. The student is competitive (academically).	3.17 (65)	3.44 (72)	3.18 (61)	2.61 (61)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$ $\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_4$ $\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_4$

Table 2 (continued)

	Group Means and (N's)				
	1 United States Spanish-surnamed	2 Anglo	3 Latino	4 Mexican	Contrasts[a]
17. The student seems pressured to achieve.	2.97 (64)	2.99 (69)	2.93 (59)	2.43 (54)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$ $(\bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_1) - \bar{X}_4$ $(\bar{X}_3 + \bar{X}_1) - \bar{X}_4$ $(\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3) - \bar{X}_4$
18. The student is perceptive.	3.64 (64)	4.12 (66)	3.85 (59)	3.56 (59)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_1$ $\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$
			Parent Items		
1. The family meets with and talks to the teacher.	2.98 (63)	3.38 (71)	2.95 (58)	2.5 (52)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$
2. Parents stress academic achievement.	3.95 (56)	3.85 (65)	3.79 (52)	2.95 (43)	$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_4$ $\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$ $\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_4$
3. The parents encourage strict controls over the student.	3.63 (54)	2.93 (69)	3.73 (51)	3.25 (44)	$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$ $\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_2$

Table 2 (continued)

	Group Means and (N's)				
	1 United States Spanish-surnamed	2 Anglo	3 Latino	4 Mexican	Contrasts[a]
4. The family inquires about the student's school work.	3.07 (61)	3.31 (70)	3.07 (59)	2.52 (50)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$
5. The parents encourage punishment for school misbehavior.	3.28 (54)	2.4 (62)	3.16 (45)	2.92 (36)	$\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$ $\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_2$
6. The family answers any notices sent by the school.	3.89 (62)	3.93 (72)	3.96 (57)	3.37 (49)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$ $\bar{X}_3 - \bar{X}_4$
7. The family participates in school activities.	2.44 (59)	2.94 (69)	2.14 (57)	2.22 (51)	$\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_4$ $\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_3$
8. The parents have inquired about employment.	1.19 (52)	1.3 (56)	1.68 (47)	1.27 (41)	$\bar{X}_3 - (\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_4)$ $\bar{X}_3 - (\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_4)$

Table 2 (continued)

	Group Means and (N's)				
	1 United States Spanish-surnamed	2 Anglo	3 Latino	4 Mexican	Contrasts[a]
Ramírez and Castañeda Items					
1. [Student] seeks guidance and demonstration from teacher.	3.63 (65)	3.28 (71)	3.64 (61)	3.66 (62)	$(\bar{X}_3 + \bar{X}_4) - \bar{X}_2$ $(\bar{X}_1 + \bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3) - \bar{X}_2$

[a] To interpret contrasts: $\bar{X}_4 - (\bar{X}_2 + \bar{X}_3)$ = The average score of the Mexican group is significantly greater (.05) than the average score of a combined Anglo and Latino group's. The subtrahend in each contrast is always the lesser value.

.91. It was .94 for the United States Spanish-surnamed group, .88 for the Anglo, .89 for the Latino, and .94 for the Mexican.

For the multivariate sample and the Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) items, the overall Spearman-Brown co-efficient was .83. Reliabilities for each of the groups were: .77 for the United States Spanish-surnamed, .86 for the Anglo, .83 for the Latino, and .87 for the Mexican.

DISCUSSION

Though eighteen student and eight parent behavior items significantly differentiated among the four ethnic groups, the most striking findings in this study were the large amount of "differences" ascribed to the Mexican group of subjects and the low criterion group validity of the Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) items.

Mexican children are perceived by their predominantly Hispanic, bilingual education teachers as being more shy, less sociable, less communicative, less assertive, less bright, less competitive, less sure, and less pressured to achieve than most of the other groups, especially Anglos. Mexican parents are also seen as less communicating than Anglo parents, less achievement motivating than all other groups of parents, and less participating than Anglo and Latino parents. Whether this is a correct perception, or a lack of understanding by teachers of the Mexican parents' character [perhaps failing to penetrate what Octavio Paz (1961) calls the Mexican's "variety of masks"] is a matter for conjecture at this time. What is critical from these results is the need to eliminate this form of social distance be it in fact or in teacher perceptions.

The only positive trait ascribed to Mexican children is that of being well-mannered. This may be due to Mexican parents' emphasis on being well-behaved (*bien educado*), as noted by Díaz-Guerrero (1967), or to the invisibility that shyness may provide. This may be interpreted as good behavior and "good manners." The latter would seem to be the most likely "cause" of the well-mannered perception almost in a manner of a composite halo effect, of the teachers' perceptions of "deficits" in Mexican children.

The ratings given the Mexican children in the student items under the *Cognitive* heading in Table 2 are particularly distressing because they come from a predominantly Hispanic group of teachers. Items 14 and 18 are especially noteworthy since both United States Spanish-surnamed and Mexican children, as a group, are seen significantly less capable than the Anglo group in the ability to learn quickly and to be perceptive. Judging the Mexican and Mexican-American child as being less intelligent than the Anglo child is not new in education (i.e., *Diana v. California State Board of Education*, 1970), yet it is a bit incongruous when it comes from predominantly Spanish bilingual teachers. It runs counter to expectations with respect to the raters' judgments and to research with respect to children's intelligence. Two examples from a growing body of research (Jensen, 1973; Legaretta, 1975) suggest that the differences between Anglo, Mexican-American, and Latino children on measures of non-verbal general intelligence are either non-existent or validly accounted for by socio-economic factors [see also, DeAvila and Havassy (1975), and Mercer and Lewis (1978)].

In fact, when hypotheses relative to the genetic-environmental controversy are analyzed using culture-fair (*Ravens Progressive Matrices*) and culture-loaded (*Peabody Picture Vocabulary*) tests, the empirical regression lines of Anglo and Mexican-American scores are explained only by the hypothetical model where "the phenotypically lower group [such as economically disadvantaged] is genetically equal to *or higher* than the phenotypically higher group" (Jensen, 1973, p. 306). In terms of the empirical data, "the Mexican group was...found equal to or higher than the white group genetically in this analysis..." (Jensen, 1973, p. 311).

The clear and overwhelming "differentness" of the Mexican group, together with the consistent pattern of traits ascribed to them by teachers, can be explained most parsimoniously in terms of the lower SES "differentness" of the Mexican group. Research literature (Freijo and Jaeger, 1976) has noted that SES is a more powerful variable than race in determining perceived differences among groups even when the race (but not the social class) of the raters is similar to that of the low SES group. The data in this study strongly support this finding. Regardless of ethnicity, language, and training, the raters in this study were better able to rate the Anglo group as measured by the higher number of responses per item on most of the items in Table 2, but were unable to escape the negative impact of SES as measured by the consistent deficit perceptions of "differentness" for the Mexican group. However, even in this unexpected outcome, a significant ethnic finding does emerge. Generally, shyness and timidity are not the personality traits found in low-SES, urban

school children. Quite the opposite. The effects of this form of "uniqueness" may be considerable for the Mexican child in terms of the behavior experienced from peers and teachers.

Therefore, to the degree that Mexican-born students are economically "different" from their Hispanic and Anglo peers and to the degree that they may be optimistically assigned to bilingual classes for a more equal educational opportunity, the results of this study call for a form of educational intervention that takes into account teacher socio-economic perceptions. Being bilingual and bicultural may not be enough. Social class "distance" may seriously limit or preclude effective, equal education. In fact, this social class phenomenon may be implicated in the results found by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1973). In this large, comprehensive investigation, it was found that both Anglo and Mexican-American teachers significantly under-praised and under-encouraged Chicano children.

The United States Spanish-surnamed group is similar to the Mexican group in non-blaming and non-hitting behaviors. Generally, however, the United States Spanish-surnamed group is perceived as being more like the Anglo and Latino groups in most behaviors. Distinct differences do appear in parental behaviors. The United States Spanish-surnamed parents and the Latino parents are viewed as being different than Anglo parents in their encouragement of strict controls and punishment for misbehavior in school. This form of behavior management may be quite congruent with child-rearing styles in these cultures. For the school, this background may serve to enhance an academically favorable home/school conti-

nuity or to set up a possible conflict between a permissive school setting and the home, thereby initiating a process of either agressive or passive alienation in the child.

The Latino child is perceived as being more similar to the Anglo child in blaming, hitting, and less well-mannered behaviors than the United States Spanish-surnamed and Mexican group. Their parents do not participate in school activities as much as Anglo parents although they are just as responsive to school notices. Further, they, more than any other group, approach the school for help in matters of employment.

Anglo children are seen to be uniquely different in a lower preference for the company of Hispanic children and in having less difficulty with self-expression. In the majority of the behaviors listed in Table 2, however, they are found to be very similar to either Latino or United States Spanish-surnamed children and very dissimilar to Mexican children.

Only one out of the 16 items that Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) have published differentiates between the Anglo (field-independent) and Mexican (field-dependent) behaviors in the ANOVA analysis. The Scheffé contrasts for that item indicate that one cannot even clearly differentiate between Mexican and Anglo groups, but that multiple contrasts must be generated in order to find the source of significance for the derived F-ratio. The more powerful MANOVA procedure failed to detect any significant differences in the United States Spanish-surnamed/Anglo, Latino/Anglo, and Mexican/Anglo pairs. This rather poor evidence of validity calls for caution in the use of the Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) child-

behavior rating scales, which appear to be empirically weak in distinguishing between the two most extreme field-dependent (Mexican) and field-independent (Anglo) "types." It may, therefore, be inappropriate for prescribing educational curricula or assessing learning styles based on ethnicity. Further research should be undertaken to see if the 16 items fare better in distinguishing children who, on the basis of direct measures (e.g., *Rod and Frame Test*), are known to be field-dependents and field-independents.

REFERENCES

Baca, P. "Learning Styles Differ--So Should Bilingual Teaching Strategies," *Un Nuevo Dia*, II, No. 2 (1976), 4-5.

Backman, Margaret E. "Patterns of Mental Abilities: Ethnic, Socioeconomic, and Sex Differences," *American Educational Research Journal*, IX, No. 1 (Winter, 1972), 1-12.

Berliner, D. C., and L. S. Cahen. "Trait-Treatment Interaction and Learning," *Review of Research in Education, I*, ed., Frederick N. Kerlinger. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers (for AERA), 1973, pp. 58-94.

Canavan, D. "Field Dependence in Children as a Function of Grade, Sex, and Ethnic Group Membership." Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Castañeda, Alfredo, Manuel Ramírez III, and Arnold P. Leslie. *New Approaches to Bilingual, Bicultural Education*. Austin: Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education, 1975.

Cronbach, Lee J., and Richard E. Snow. *Individual Differences in Learning Ability as a Function of Instructional Variables*. Final Report. Stanford University, School of Education, Contract No. OEC-4-6-061269-1217, United States Office of Education, 1969.

DeAvila, Edward A., and Sharon E. Duncan. "Piagetian Alternatives to IQ: Mexican American Study," *Issues in the Classification of Children*, ed. Nicholas Hobbs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975, pp. 246-265.

Diana v. *California State Board of Education*. Civil Action No. C-70-37 (N.D. Cal.), 1970.

Díaz-Guerrero, Rogelio. *Psychology of the Mexican: Culture and Personality*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967.

Fernandez, C., R. W. Espinoza, and S. M. Dornbusch. "Low Academic Standards for Chicano Aspiration," *Report on Education Research*. (Abstract). October 8, 1975.

Freijo, Tom D., and Richard M. Jaeger. "Social Class and Race as Concomitants of Composite Halo in Teachers' Evaluative Rating of Pupils," *American Educational Research Journal*, XIII, No. 1 (Winter, 1976), 1-14.

Holtzman, Wayne H., Rogelio Díaz-Guerrero, and Jon D. Swartz. *Personality Development in Two Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Longitudinal Study of School Children in Mexico and the United States*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.

Jensen, Arthur R. *Educability and Group Differences*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Kagán, Spencer, and Millard C. Madsen. "Experimental Analyses of Cooperation and Competition of Anglo-American and Mexican Children," *Developmental Psychology*, VI, No. 1 (January, 1972), 49-59.

Legaretta, D. "An Investigation of the Use or Non-Use of Formal English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) Training on the Acquisition of English by Spanish-Speaking Kindergarten Children in Traditional Bilingual Classrooms." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1975.

Leifer, A. "Ethnic Patterns in Cognitive Tasks," Proceedings of the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1972.

Lesser, Gerald S., Gordon Fifer, and Donald H. Clark. *Mental Abilities of Children in Different Social and Cultural Groups*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, XXX, No. 4. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Mercer, Jane R. "I.Q.: The Lethal Label," *Psychology Today*, VI, No. 4 (September, 1972), 44-47.

_____, and J. F. Lewis. *System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment*. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1978.

Paz, Octavio. *The Labyrinth of Solitude: Life and Thought in Mexico*. Translated by Lysander Kemp. New York: Grove Press, 1961.

Ramírez III, Manuel, and Alfredo Castañeda. *Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development, and Education*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

_____, and Douglass R. Price-Williams. "Cognitive Styles of Children of Three Ethnic Groups in the United States," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, V (June, 1974), 212-219.

Stodolsky, Susan S., and Gerald S. Lesser. "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXVII (Fall, 1967), 546-593.

United States Bureau of the Census. *Selected Characteristics of Persons and Families of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Other Spanish Origin*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. "Teachers and Students, Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students," *Mexican American Educational Study*. Report V. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Witkin, Herman A., R. B. Dyk, H. F. Faterson, D. R. Goodenough, and S. A. Karp. *Psychological Differentiation; Studies of Development*. Potomac: Erlbaum, 1962.

Richard A. Figueroa is an Assistant Professor of Education at the University of California, Davis. His research interests have included the diagnosis of mental retardation (with particular attention to the concept and measurement of adaptive behavior), field dependence, and non-discriminatory assessment.

During the last three years, Dr. Figueroa has published on the System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (Mercer and Lewis, 1979). He is presently directing a three-year study on the validity of this system of tests.

Elmer A. Gallegos is an Assistant Principal at A. P. Giannini Middle School. He is the former project director of the Project to Advance Cultural Opportunities (PACO). He also served as supervisor for the Spanish bilingual education program in the San Francisco Unified School District from 1967 to 1976.

His publications include an article co-authored with Elizabeth Toward in 1970, "Bilingual Education for San Francisco's Spanish-Speaking Students," in George W. Smith and Owen L. Coskey's, *Successful School Practices for Mexican Americans;* and "The Spanish Reply" co-authored with Guy Wright, which appeared in the *San Francisco Examiner*, April 19, 1974.

Gallegos is affiliated with the United Administrators of San Francisco, Urban School Administrators, Latin American Teachers Association, and Phi Delta Kappa.